Remarks

Claims 1-10, 12-15, 17-20, and 22-32 are pending in this application. Applicants have

not amended the claims. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this

application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,636,875 to Bashant et al.

and U.S. patent publication 2005/0033481 to Budhraja et al. The Examiner rejected claim 8

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhu et al. in view of Bashant et al. and

Budhraja et al. and further in view of DeVos et al.

The combination of Zhu et al., Bashant, and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the

invention recited in independent claims 1 or 15 since, among other things, the combination does

not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate

which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements

of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and

mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes

of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. The Examiner asserts that

pages 46-47 and Fig. 11 of Zhu et al. suggests standard interfaces. However, neither this passage

nor this figure suggests such interfaces.

Rather, on page 46, Zhu et al. describes and Fig. 11 illustrates multiple consumer

services, such as Bidding Service, EMS Service, SCADA Service, etc. As stated on page 46, the "services initiate service requests and consume responses". This passage goes on to state that the "services are normally user interface (UI) services". Furthermore, the UI services "perform tasks such as requesting information from a user or passing information to a user".

Significantly, Zhu et al. does on to state that, "Some UI consumer services are built to separate the specific user interface implementation from the more general dialog flow and backend interactions." This, along with Fig. 11, clearly suggests that that each element includes its own user interface (UI). Still further, on page 47 Zhu et al. describes UI consumer services and a distribution operator UI and how different information may be cached for display.

Additionally, Fig. 8 on page 45 of Zhu et al. also suggests that the different interfaces. This discussion clearly suggests that Zhu et al. does not suggest standard user interfaces and input and display methods.

The Examiner asserts that Page 45, first paragraph, suggests data consistency. It appears as if this paragraph only suggests orchestration service. There is nothing in this paragraph that suggests data consistency as recited in the claims as described in the specification.

Furthermore, Zhu et al. at page 46, Service-Based Architecture, third paragraph, only relates to utility services, but none of the other services described in the first paragraph of this section. This suggests that there is no replication of data among all of these services. Zhu et al. appears to suggest web-based communication among elements of a power system. Zhu et al.

suggests that "legacy" systems will simply operate as before.

Bashant does not suggest any of the elements of the claimed suggestion not suggested by Zhu et al. Along these lines, Bashant does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. Bashant only suggests adding data of known types of object, such as claims, billing, and web sales. Additionally, Bashant relates to synchronizing related data storage elements in disparate storage systems. The same data is entered in each system, as described at col. 10, lines 6-8. On the other hand, the claimed invention relates to disparate systems in which data may be separately entered in each system and then the method according to the claimed invention processes the information so that the data may be exchanged between disparate systems and duplicated in each system. The claimed invention is not a simple entry of the same data in a number of times in systems.

Additionally, Bashant et al. requires an application to send to a hub a header with new data so that it will be known where the data might be placed in a related system, as described at col. 6, line 45, through col. 7, line 10. As such, Bashant et al. requires modifications to or intervention in existing systems. On the other hand, as illustrated, for example, in Figs. 1 and 2, the claimed invention includes a system that does not require such modifications or intervention. This makes the claimed invention simpler, less costly and easier to implement since systems do

not need to be modified to send out such headers. The claimed invention is meant to eliminate the need for generating elements such as headers required by Bashant et al. Additionally, Bashant et al. states that the header is necessary when data is changed as described at col. 10, line 65, though col. 11, line 6. The headers require the user of a system to know data that is automatically provided by the claimed invention. Without headers, the system suggested by Bashant et al. does not function.

Budhraja et al. does not suggest any of the elements of the claimed invention that are not suggested by Zhu et al. and/or Bashant. Along these lines, Budhraja et al. does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register. The Examiner only cited Budhraja et al. as suggesting interface elements. Even if Budhraja et al. suggested such interface elements, Budhraja et al. does not suggest the elements of the claimed invention not suggested by Zhu et al. or Bashant.

In view of the above, the combination of Zhu et al., Bashant and Budhraja et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-32. Therefore, the combination of Zhu et al., Bashant and Budhraja et al. does not make the invention recited in claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-20 and 22-32 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Zhu et al., Bashant, Budhraja et al. and DeVos et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 8 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest providing the interfaces with context sensitive navigation functions that indicate which of a plurality of systems is active, providing a virtual asset register that includes elements of the systems, a model for exchange of data between the systems, and cross-reference and mapping of relationships of the elements of the systems, and checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing the virtual asset register, replicating data related to the new object from the new object to other systems and relevant systems, establishing a consistency of accessed or retrieved data in the relevant systems by mapping the new object using the virtual asset register or checking a consistency of attributes of the accessed or retrieved data utilizing a virtual asset register by identifying at least one of the new or a given object or copies of the new or a given object and comparing attributes of all copies of the same new or given object. The Examiner only cites DeVos et al. as suggesting using a common information model with a resource description framework and a uniform resource identifier compatible with as an identifier with a standard for the resource description framework. These elements do not suggest the other aspects of the claimed invention not suggested by Zhu et al., Bashant, or Budhraja et al.

Accordingly, the invention recited in claim 8 is not obvious in view of the combination of Zhu et al., Bashant, Budhraja et al. and DeVos et al. Thus, the combination of Zhu et al., Bashant, Budhraja et al. and DeVos et al. and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 1, 2011

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicants
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300